

~~SECRET~~19th December, 1959.COCOM Document 3715.26/2BCOORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONITEM 1526 - COMMUNICATIONS CABLE4th December, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.3, 6 and 9, 3715.00/1, 3715.26/1 and W.P. 1526/1 - 5.

1. The CHAIRMAN opened the second round of discussion on Item 1526 by inviting the Committee to give views on the Franco-German proposal set out in paragraph 12 of COCOM Doc. No. 3715.26/1, and on the proposal just submitted by the United States Delegation in W.P. 1526/4.

2. The UNITED STATES Delegate stated that his authorities were fully convinced that the cable covered by the present definition was perfectly suitable for use in an early warning system and that, in view of the Bloc's shortage in this field, it would be particularly ill-advised to supply them with equipment which they could use for military purposes. The United States Delegation believed that the technical arguments adduced in support of the Franco-German proposal had not given adequate proof that the cable excluded by this proposal could be termed railway signalling cable and that it was without the highest strategic significance for the Sino-Soviet Bloc. In conclusion the Delegate stated that the prior consultation procedure provided the only means of meeting the security requirements in this field, and recalled that a recent request brought before the Committee involving cables covered by Item 1526 was evidence of the possibilities offered by this procedure.

3. The Delegate then referred to his Delegation's latest proposal, reading as follows:

"Governments will give sympathetic consideration to exceptions requests for the shipment of reasonable quantities of communications cable where the proposing Government has concluded that the following conditions are met:

1. The cable is part of a complete railway signal system installation of which all significant elements are known;
2. Installation of the cable and associated equipment will be made by Free World firms;
3. The character and capacity of the cable and the location of the installation make it unlikely that it will be diverted to strategic uses within the Bloc."

He drew the Committee's attention to the differences existing between this text and the one submitted by his Delegation during the first round of discussion (COCOM Doc. No. 3715.26/1, paragraph 11 A). He stressed that his Government had tried to meet the views expressed by the various delegations on their initial proposal, and stated that the present wording should enable the Committee to deal effectively with any exception requests submitted, since the requirements for sympathetic consideration of exception cases were laid down therein.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3715.26/2B

4. The JAPANESE Delegate gave his Delegation's agreement to the Franco-German proposal and undertook to transmit the latest United States proposal to his Government.
5. The FRENCH Delegate noted that the United States proposal contained interesting elements and was prepared to add points 1, 2 and 3 to the Franco-German Note. In point 2, however, it should be specified that the installation would be "made or supervised" instead of "made" by Free World firms. Turning to the United States Delegate's objections to the Franco-German proposal, the Delegate stated that France had a vital interest in seeing that the Soviet Bloc did not develop its early warning system. He stressed that the conditions laid down in the Franco-German text, which included technical criteria and would also contain criteria governing supervision of the installation, provided the best means of preventing the equipment exported to be put to strategic use. The Delegate then explained the technical reasons for which it was impossible from the practical point of view to use signalling cable for communications purposes (the text of this statement is set out in W.P. 1526/5).
6. The GERMAN Delegate agreed to add the three points contained in the United States proposal to the Franco-German text provided that point 2 were changed in the manner suggested by the French Delegate. There was still basic disagreement, however, since the United States proposal maintained the prior consultation procedure while the Franco-German proposal, supported by the majority of the Committee, allowed administrative exceptions under specific conditions.
7. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate agreed to the Franco-German proposal which his authorities firmly believed would in no way endanger Free World security. He noted that most of the cable produced in the Western countries, and in particular long-distance telephone cable, would still fall under Item 1526.
8. The ITALIAN and NETHERLANDS Delegations undertook to recommend to their Governments the French Delegation's proposal (paragraph 5 above) to add points 1, 2(amended as suggested by the French Delegate) and 3 of the United States proposal to the Franco-German Note. The JAPANESE Delegate agreed to this proposal ad referendum.
9. The UNITED STATES Delegate appreciated the conciliatory attitude shown by the French Delegation in agreeing to include the conditions specified in his Delegation's proposal in the Note proposed by the French and German Delegations. He noted, however, that the question of principle was still unresolved, some delegations advocating an administrative exceptions procedure with ex post facto notification, while the United States Delegation favoured the prior consultation procedure. The same arguments applied here as in the case of Item 1520.
10. The FRENCH Delegate stated that, in order to help in reaching agreement, his Delegation would also be willing to agree that licences issued for administrative exception exports should be reported immediately to the Committee.
11. The COMMITTEE agreed to resume discussion on the 14th December.